

EXHIBIT B

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK**

JAMES E. SHELTON, individually and on behalf of all others similarly situated,

Plaintiff,

v.

PRIORITY CONCEPTS INC.

Defendant.

Case No.

CLASS ACTION

JURY TRIAL DEMANDED

CLASS ACTION COMPLAINT AND DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL

Plaintiff James E. Shelton (“Plaintiff” or “Mr. Shelton”) brings this Class Action Complaint and Demand for Jury Trial against Defendant Priority Concepts Inc. (“Defendant” or “Priority”) and alleges as follows:

1. Telemarketing calls are intrusive. A great many people object to these calls, which interfere with their lives, tie up their phone lines, and cause confusion and disruption on phone records. Faced with growing public criticism of abusive telephone marketing practices, Congress enacted the Telephone Consumer Protection Act of 1991. Pub. L. No. 102-243, 105 Stat. 2394 (1991) (codified at 47 U.S.C. § 227). As Congress explained, the law was a response to Americans ‘outraged over the proliferation of intrusive, nuisance calls to their homes from telemarketers’ *id.* § 2(6), and sought to strike a balance between ‘[i]ndividuals’ privacy rights, public safety interests, and commercial freedoms’ *id.* § 2(9).

2. “The law opted for a consumer-driven process that would allow objecting individuals to prevent unwanted calls to their homes. The result of the telemarketing regulations was the national Do-Not-Call registry. *See* 47 C.F.R. § 64.1200(c)(2). Within the federal government’s web of indecipherable acronyms and byzantine programs, the Do-Not-Call registry

stands out as a model of clarity. It means what it says. If a person wishes to no longer receive telephone solicitations, he can add his number to the list. The TCPA then restricts the telephone solicitations that can be made to that number. *See id.*; 16 C.F.R. § 310.4(b)(iii)(B) (‘It is an abusive telemarketing act or practice and a violation of this Rule for a telemarketer to . . . initiat[e] any outbound telephone call to a person when . . . [t]hat person’s telephone number is on the “do-not-call” registry, maintained by the Commission.’)...Private suits can seek either monetary or injunctive relief. *Id.*...This private cause of action is a straightforward provision designed to achieve a straightforward result. Congress enacted the law to protect against invasions of privacy that were harming people. The law empowers each person to protect his own personal rights. Violations of the law are clear, as is the remedy. Put simply, the TCPA affords relief to those persons who, despite efforts to avoid it, have suffered an intrusion upon their domestic peace.” *Krakauer v. Dish Network, L.L.C.*, 925 F.3d 643, 649-50 (4th Cir. 2019).

3. The Plaintiff brings this action to enforce the consumer-privacy provisions of the TCPA alleging that Priority violated the TCPA by making telemarketing calls to Plaintiff and other putative class members listed on the National Do Not Call Registry without their written consent as well as calling people who had previously asked to no longer receive calls.

PARTIES

4. Plaintiff James E. Shelton is an individual residing in the Eastern District of Pennsylvania.

5. Defendant Priority Concepts Inc. is a corporation incorporated in New York and having its principal place of business in this District.

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

6. This Court has federal question jurisdiction pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1331 and 47

15. Pursuant to this statutory mandate, the FCC established company-specific “do not call” rules. *In the Matter of Rules and Regulations Implementing the Telephone Consumer Protection Act of 1991*, 7 F.C.C. Rcd. 8752 (Oct. 16, 1992) (“TCPA Implementation Order”).

17. Specifically, these regulations require a company to keep a written policy, available upon demand, for maintaining a do not call list, train personnel engaged in telemarketing on the existence and use of its internal do not call list, and record and honor “do not call” requests for no less than five years from the time the request is made. 47 C.F.R. §§ 64.1200(d)(1, 2, 3, 6).

FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS

20. At no point did the Plaintiff consent to receiving telemarketing calls from the Defendants prior to receiving the automated calls at issue.

21. Plaintiff's telephone number, (484) XXX-XXXX, is a residential, non-commercial telephone number.

22. Mr. Shelton uses the number for personal, residential, and household reasons.

23. Mr. Shelton does not use the number for business reasons or business use.

24. The number is a residential telephone line because it is assigned to a residential telephone exchange service for consumers and is not assigned to a telephone exchange service for businesses.

25. Plaintiff's telephone number has been listed on the National Do Not Call Registry since he listed it there in 2015, more than eight years prior to the calls at issue.

26. Plaintiff has never been a customer of Priority and never consented to receive calls from Priority.

27. In fact, the Plaintiff explicitly requested that the calls from Priority stop on multiple occasions, including via email to one of Priority's partners in 2022 and on December 8, 2023 via an email sent to info@priorityconceptsinc.com and on a telephone call that same day from the 516-452-5653 number.

28. Despite this, the Plaintiff received at least twenty calls from Priority between November 15, 2023 and December 21, 2023 from various caller IDs, including 917-387-4594, 516-452-5653, 727-378-2875, 917-382-5350, and 516-619-9359.

29. The calls were all placed from agents who affirmatively identified that they were calling from Priority Concepts.

30. All the calls were sent to attempt to sell the Plaintiff Employee Retention Credit tax preparation services and Employee Retention Credit anticipation loans.

31. The Plaintiff also received emails from various emails and individuals at Priority Concepts as a result of the illegal calls, further solidifying the fact that he received illegal calls from Priority Concepts.

32. The calls were unwanted.

33. The calls were nonconsensual encounters.

34. Plaintiff's privacy has been repeatedly violated by the above-described telemarketing calls.

35. Plaintiff never provided his consent or requested the calls.

36. Plaintiff and the Class have been harmed by the acts of Defendant because their privacy has been violated and they were annoyed and harassed. In addition, the calls occupied their telephone lines, storage space, and bandwidth, rendering them unavailable for legitimate communication, including while driving, working, and performing other critical tasks.

CLASS ACTION ALLEGATIONS

37. Plaintiff incorporates by reference all other paragraphs of this Complaint as if fully stated herein.

38. Plaintiff brings this action on behalf of himself and the following classes (the “Classes”) pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 23.

National DNC Class: All persons in the United States whose (1) telephone numbers were on the National Do Not Call Registry for at least 31 days, (2) but who received more than one telemarketing call from or on behalf of Defendant encouraging the purchase of Priority's goods or services, (3) within a 12-month period (4) at any time in the period that begins four years before the date of filing this Complaint to trial.

Internal Do Not Call Class: All persons within the United States to whom: (1) Defendant (or a third-party acting on behalf of Defendant) sent (2) two or more telemarketing calls in a 12-month period, (3) who were not current customers of the Defendant at the time of the calls, (4) who had previously asked for the calls to stop and (5) within the four years prior to the filing of the Complaint.

39. Numerosity: The exact number of Class members is unknown but based on the *en masse* nature of telemarketing is believed to be at least hundreds of persons at this time, and individual joinder in this case is impracticable. Class members can be easily identified through Defendant's records, or those of their agents.

40. **Typicality:** Plaintiff's claims are typical of the claims of other Class members in that Plaintiff, and Class members, sustained damages arising out of Defendant's telemarketing calls and Class members sustained similar injuries and damages as a result of Defendant's uniform illegal conduct.

41. **Adequacy:** Plaintiff will fairly and adequately represent and protect the interests of the Classes and has retained counsel competent and experienced in complex class actions to vigorously prosecute this action on behalf of the Classes. Plaintiff has no interests that conflict with, or are antagonistic to those of, the Classes, and Defendant has no defenses unique to Plaintiff.

42. **Commonality and Predominance:** There are many questions of law and fact common to the claims of Plaintiff and members of the Classes, and those questions predominate over any questions that may affect individual members of the Classes. Common questions for the Classes include, but are not necessarily limited to, the following:

- a. Whether Defendant obtained “prior express invitation or permission” under the TCPA, before the calls at issue;
- b. whether Defendant recorded or honored “do not call” requests of Plaintiff and members of the Internal Do Not Call Class;
- c. Whether Defendant has established and implemented, with due care, reasonable practices and procedures to effectively prevent telephone solicitations in violation of the TCPA’s do-not-call regulations;
- d. Whether Defendant should be held liable for violations committed on its behalf; and
- e. Damages, including whether any violations were performed willfully or knowingly, such that Plaintiff and the other Class members are entitled to treble damages under

COUNT I
Violations of the TCPA, 47 U.S.C. § 227
(On Behalf of Plaintiff and the National DNC Class)

45. Plaintiff realleges and incorporates by reference each and every allegation set forth in the preceding paragraphs.

46. It is a violation of the TCPA to initiate any telephone solicitation to a residential telephone subscriber who has registered his or her telephone number on the National Do Not Call Registry. 47 C.F.R. 64.1200(c)(2).

47. Defendant and/or its affiliates, agents, and/or other persons or entities acting on Defendant's behalf violated the TCPA by causing multiple telephone solicitation calls to be initiated to Plaintiff and members of the National DNC Class in a 12-month period, despite the person's registration of his or her telephone numbers on the National Do Not Call Registry.

48. These violations were willful or knowing.

49. As a result of Defendant and/or its affiliates, agents, and/or other persons or entities acting on Defendant's behalf's violations of the TCPA's national do-not-call rule, Plaintiff and members of the National DNC Class are each entitled to an injunction and up to \$500 in damages for each such violation. 47 U.S.C. § 227(c)(5).

50. Because such violations were willful or knowing, the Court should treble the amount of statutory damages, pursuant to 47 U.S.C. § 227(c)(5).

COUNT II
Violation of the Telephone Consumer Protection Act
(47 U.S.C. § 227(c)(5) & 47 C.F.R. § 64.1200(d))
(On Behalf of Plaintiff and the Internal Do Not Call Registry Class)

51. Plaintiff incorporates the allegations from all previous paragraphs as if fully set forth herein.

53. Defendant's violations were negligent, willful, or knowing.

54. As a result of Defendant's and/or its affiliates, agents, and/or other persons or entities acting on Defendant's behalf, violations of the TCPA, 47 U.S.C. § 227, Plaintiff and members of the Internal Do Not Call Class are entitled to an award of up to \$500 and in damages for each and every call sent and up to \$1,500 in damages if the calls are found to be willful.

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff, individually and on behalf of the National DNC Class, and Internal Do Not Call Registry Class, respectfully request that the Court enter judgment against Defendant for:

- A. Certification of the National DNC Class as alleged herein;
- B. Certification of the Internal Do Not Call Registry Class as alleged herein;
- C. Appointment of Plaintiff as representative of the Classes;
- D. Appointment of the undersigned as counsel for the Classes;
- E. Damages to Plaintiff and members of the Classes pursuant to 47 U.S.C. § 227(c)(5);
- F. Injunctive relief for Plaintiff and members of the Classes, pursuant to 47 U.S.C. § 227(c)(5), preventing the Defendant from making calls to numbers listed on the National Do Not Call Registry and/or preventing the Defendant from making calls to numbers which have previously requested that the Defendant not call;

Plaintiff hereby demands a trial by jury.

/s/ Andrew Roman Perrong
Andrew Roman Perrong, Esq.
PA Bar #333687 (*Pro Hac Vice*)
Perrong Law LLC
2657 Mount Carmel Avenue
Glenside, Pennsylvania 19038
Phone: 215-225-5529 (CALL-LAW)
Facsimile: 888-329-0305
a@perronglaw.com